

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS



THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

AN EXPLORATION OF RELATIONSHIPS AMONG PERSONAL
CHARACTERISTICS, SELF-DISCLOSURE, AND PREDICTED
JOB SUCCESS OF COUNSELORS IN TRAINING



BY
LANALEE PARKINSON

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL 1969

thesis
1969(F).
188

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled An Exploration of Relationships Among Personal Characteristics, Self-disclosure, and Predicted Job Success of Counselors in Training, submitted by Mrs. Lanalee Parkinson in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the nature of relationships among predicted counselor success and personal characteristics of counselor candidates.

Two hypotheses were formulated from research and theoretical considerations: Hypothesis I--high-performance-rated and low-performance-rated counselor trainees would not differ as to personal characteristics as measured by the CPI (Gough, 1957) and Hypothesis II--high-performance-rated and low-performance-rated trainees would differ in the amount of self-disclosure (transparency) as measured by the SDI60 (Jourard, 1964).

The CPI and the SDI60 were administered to forty-four students. All students were participants in an individual counseling practicum. Predicted job success was determined by final practicum grades. The data collected were used to test the two hypotheses as well as to explore other possible relationships among the variables.

The data analysis led to the following results:

1. that high-performance-rated and low-performance-rated counselor candidates do not differ as measured by the following: (a) the eighteen scales of the CPI; (b) total disclosure scores on the SDI60; (c) total disclosure scores and best weighted combinations of CPI scales.

These findings indicated the support of Hypothesis I and

the rejection of Hypothesis II. It was concluded that, in the prediction of job success, or allotment of final practicum grades, more emphasis was placed on academic abilities than on other personal characteristics measured by the CPI and SDI₆₀.

Suggestions for future research included:

1. that a different criterion be used as an indicator of predicted job success, i.e. one which included evidence of therapeutic outcome as a result of the counseling relationship;
2. that the 'dyadic effect' or mutuality of disclosure between client and counselor-trainee be explored;
3. that sex and marital status be considered;
- and 4. that a depth-of-disclosure index would add substance to future studies in this area.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express her sincere appreciation to the following persons for their assistance: Dr. Donald C. Fair for his patience, support, constructive criticism and editorial aid as chairman of the thesis committee; Dr. D. W. R. Wilson and Dr. P. W. Koziey for helpful suggestions as the members of the thesis committee; Mr. Prem Gupta for his thought-provoking discussion; Mr. Dan Precht for his help with the statistics; the students of the individual counseling practicum who served as subjects for this study; Mr. M. Blackburn for his faith that the project would be completed; my parents for their continued interest; in particular to Mr. P. Camidge for his constant encouragement and friendship throughout the trying moments of this work. Special appreciation goes to my daughter Kelly-Lynn for providing a most enjoyable diversion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part I - Theory and Method

Chapter I	Page
The Problem	1
Introduction	1
The Problem and Its Importance	5
Assumptions	5
Limitations of the Study	6
Definitions	7
Overview of the Thesis	8
Chapter II	
Review of Related Literature	9
Introduction	9
Self-Disclosure	9
Counselor Personality	19
Hypothesis	25
Chapter III	
Research Design and Procedure	27
The Sample	27
Instrumentation and Data Collection	28
A. Personality Measures	28
B. Final Practicum Grade	33

Part II - Data Analysis, Implications and Appendices

Chapter IV	Page
Treatment of Data and Conclusions	34
Data Collection	35
Treatment of Data	35
Conclusions	54

Chapter V	
Discussion, Implications and Suggestions for Future Research	56
Discussion	56
Implications	61
Suggestions for Future Research	62

Appendices:

- A. Directions for the CPI
Description of CPI Scales
- B. Directions for the SDI₆₀
- C. Counseling Practicum Evaluation
Sheet
- D. Letter of Invitation to Subjects

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Final Grades for Trainees in the Individual Counseling Practicum	35
II. Summary of $\bar{X}$'s & S.D.'s of CPI Scores for Male Trainees, n = 33	36
III. Summary of $\bar{X}$'s & S.D.'s of CPI Scores for Female Trainees, n = 11	37
IV. Summary of $\bar{X}$'s, S.D.'s & t-test Values of Low-Rated vs. High-Rated Trainees on the CPI, n = 43, $p \leq .01$	38
V. Mann-Whitney U Test-CPI Scores for Low-Rated, n = 3, vs. High-Rated, n = 4, Trainees ($\alpha = .05$)	40
VI. Summary of Multiple Discriminant Analysis for CPI Responses of Married Males from the Four Sub-Groups: LR-LD, LR-HD, HR-HD, HR-LD, n = 30	41
VII. $\bar{X}$'s & S.D.'s of Total Target Scores and Total Disclosure Scores for Married Males, n = 30, on SDI60	43
VIII. Summary of t-tests, $\bar{X}$'s & S.D.'s of Total Target Scores and Total Disclosure Scores for Married Male Trainees, n = 30	44
IX. First Aspect (Attitudes), Summary of Analysis of Variance for LR vs. HR Married Males, n = 30	44
X. Second Aspect (Interests), Summary of Analysis of Variance for LR vs. HR Married Males, n = 30	45

Table	Page
XI. Third Aspect (Work); Summary of Analysis of Variance for LR vs. HR Married Males, n = 30	45
XII. Fourth Aspect (Money); Summary of Analysis of Variance for LR vs. HR Married Males, n = 30	46
XIII. Fifth Aspect (Personality); Summary of Analysis of Variance for LR vs. HR Married Males, n = 30	46
XIV. Sixth Aspect (Body); Summary of Analysis of Variance for LR vs. HR Married Males, n = 30	47
XV. Summary of Scheffé Test of $\bar{X}$ Differences Among Total Target Scores for First Aspect (Attitude); Married Males, n = 30	49
XVI. Summary of Scheffé Test of $\bar{X}$ Differences Among Total Target Scores for Second Aspect (Interest); Married Males, n = 30	49
XVII. Summary of Scheffé Test of $\bar{X}$ Differences Among Total Target Scores for Third Aspect (Work); Married Males, n = 30	49
XVIII. Summary of Scheffé Test of $\bar{X}$ Differences Among Total Target Scores for Fourth Aspect (Money); Married Males, n = 30	50
XIX. Summary of Scheffé Test of $\bar{X}$ Differences Among Total Target Scores for Fifth Aspect (Personality); Married Males, n = 30	50
XX. Summary of Scheffé Test of $\bar{X}$ Differences Among Total Target Scores for Sixth Aspect (Body); Married Males, n = 30	50
XXI. $\bar{X}$'s & S.D.'s of Married Males on Age, Disclosure to Targets (SDI ₆₀), and Final Practicum Grade, n = 30	51

Table	Page
XXII. Summary of Factor Analysis of Age, SDI60 and Final Rating of Married Males, n = 30 (varimax)	53
XXIII. $\bar{X}$'s & S.D.'s of Female Trainees, for Disclosure to Male Friend, MF, to Female Friend, FF, and Total Disclosure, TD, n = 10	54

PART I: THEORY AND METHOD

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

I. INTRODUCTION

Individuals in a variety of professions conduct interviews and advise others; however, a unique combination of attributes is needed by a counselor to facilitate client growth, self-exploration, and behavior modification (Thompson and Super, 1964; Rogers, 1958; Halkides, G., 1958; Truax and Carkhuff, 1963, 1967). This study is an exploration of a set of attributes or personal characteristics of the counselor-in-training and of his willingness to be open or self-disclosing in relation to predicted success as a counselor.

The importance of counselor personality in the therapeutic situation has been stressed by both clinicians and researchers. (Jourard, 1964; Truax and Carkhuff, 1968). Counseling research has given extensive consideration to the nature of the relationship and to those counselor attributes which best facilitate a climate of growth for the client (Fair, 1968; Rogers, 1957; Dymond, 1950; Truax and Carkhuff, 1968).

Pierog (M. Ed. Thesis, 1968) has provided a review of the research that has sought to outline the important aspects of the Rogerian model. Empathy, congruence, and acceptance of the other are the major characteristics therein.

The counselor's reflection of his understanding must occur in an atmosphere of acceptance or unconditional positive regard (Rogers, 1958). Truax and Carkhuff (1967) point out that this acceptance is essentially a non-possessive warmth without imposing conditions. The basic goal is to facilitate the counselees growth in helping him to exercise choice in decision-making functions.

The degree of success in the relationship is based upon the extent to which the counselor exhibits these attitudes and can accurately perceive the psychological world of the client (Rogers, 1958). This skill in perception is a matter of registering and responding to many kinds of stimuli as they are presented. In lieu of this skill, both the client's and the counselor's "presentation of self" (Goffman, 1959), assume increased importance. West (1968) noted the relation between self-congruence and the presentation of self:

The relevance of these concepts to counseling and guidance derives from the implication that a healthy presentation of self consists of a presentation that is isomorphic with objective reality, i.e. an authentic or congruent presentation (p. 7).

Although much of the past research has concentrated upon client "presentation of self" (personality) and counselor effect in the relationship (Callis, Polmantier and Roeber, 1957), the personality of the counselor has been given some consideration.

Truax and Carkhuff (1963) explored this relationship in terms of therapist genuineness or self-congruence. Self-congruence refers in particular to transparency of the counselor in the relationship. This dimension has also received attention from Butler, Rice and Wagstaff (1962).

As early as thirty years ago, Lewin (1935) described degrees of readiness to disclose personal information in terms of social distance. However, Jourard (1964) was the first to make extensive use of the term "self-disclosure" in psychological investigations.

Dissatisfied with the traditional psychotherapeutical model where the patient was involved in a process of self-disclosure and self-exploration, and where the therapist facilitated this in a non-directive, impersonal manner, Jourard experienced a desire to respond openly to his clients. He found that this often resulted in his disclosing significant information about himself to the client (Jourard, 1964).

Repeatedly, this had the effect of removing distance between himself and the client, thereby thrusting them into more of a friendship than into the traditional counselor-counselee relationship. Acting upon his realization, Jourard studied a variety of situations in an attempt to determine the effects of mutual disclosure between therapist and client in the therapeutic relationship (Jourard, 1968).

Briefly then, transparency can provide a model, i.e. openness in the therapist will be more likely to result in client openness, as well as relieve some of the ambiguity often feared by clients in the situation (Bordin, 1955, 1955a; Digner, 1958; Ferguson, 1967; Jourard, 1964; Truax and Carkhuff, 1963; West, 1968). Truax and Carkhuff (1963) lend further support to the idea that "the greater the patient's engagement in the process of deep self-disclosure or exploration, the greater the degree of constructive personality change" and therefore, the more successful the encounter.

Since transparency or self-disclosure appears to relate to growing awareness of all aspects of self (Jourard and Lasakow, 1958), other aspects of counselor personality become significant. Several investigators have found that counselors and counselors-in-training have other specific, identifiable traits (Havens, 1966; Holt, 1962; Karmel, 1961; Ferguson, 1966; Pierog, 1968; Reeling, 1962; Sawatsky, 1968; Truax and Carkhuff, 1963).

Holt (1962) found that counselors can be discriminated from other professionals regarding specific personal variables. Karmel (1962), using the MMPI, distinguished teachers from counselors on their relative proneness toward anxiety, self-depreciation, introversion and withdrawal. Leona Tyler (1961) presented a summary of research in this area. She outlined a series of studies designed by Cottle (1953, 1954) and associates at the University of Kansas.

Cottle, Lewis and Penny (1954), Cottle and Wands (1955), Cottle, Pownall and Steimal (1955) compared teachers to counselors. Interesting differences between the two professions emerged. This suggests that counselors have unique and identifiable personal characteristics when compared to other professionals.

Other research has considered the relationship between personal characteristics and some aspect of success in counseling (Coutts, 1962; Havens, 1966; Jourard, 1964; Truax and Carkhuff, 1967). Tyler (1961) looked into the implications of earlier research in this area (Arbuckle, 1956; Abeles, 1958; and Brams, 1961) and suggested that further study is needed before any meaningful conclusions can be reached about the nature of counselor personalities and the relationship

between personality and job success.

II. THE PROBLEM AND ITS IMPORTANCE

With the success of the therapeutic relationship depending upon counselor self-congruence (transparency), (Allen, 1966; Jourard, 1964; Rogers, 1958; Truax and Carkhuff, 1963), his accurate understanding of the client's psychological world (Ferguson, 1966; Goffman, 1959; West, 1968) and other aspects of his personality (Ferguson, 1966; Jourard and Lasakow, 1958; Pierog, 1968; Rogers, 1958; Tyler, 1961; West, 1968), these factors are indeed worthy of further study.

Also, despite the interest manifested and research carried out, there is little agreement as to the exact nature of the relationship between counselor characteristics and job success.

The major purpose of this investigation is to explore relationships among personal characteristics, including willingness to be self-disclosing, and supervisor ratings of counselors-in-training.

It is also hoped that the descriptive information obtained will provoke other research into the area.

The findings of this study will hopefully provide added information about counselor trainees. In this regard, an immediate, pragmatic value may be realized in that the results could prove relevant to the problem of criteria used in pre-training selection of trainees.

III. ASSUMPTIONS

Any inquiry is based upon a variety of underlying assumptions,

presuppositions and possible verbal inconsistencies or irregularities. Therefore, it is important to bring some of the more general assumptions into awareness.

The basic assumption here is that counselor-candidates are willing to disclose themselves with honesty and integrity on a self-answer inventory.

This assumption arises from the rather broad and unspecific theory upon which the study is based, which is simply that counselors do exhibit identifiable personalities, that self-disclosure is a measurable trait, and is one which is facilitative in the counseling relationship. It is further assumed that supervisor ratings will provide a criterion which may form the basis of exploration of the nature of the relationship between self-disclosure and top-rated counselors-in-training, and self-disclosure and low-rated counselors-in-training (The actual validity of this assumption will be discussed in a later chapter).

IV. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

- (1) No measure of change of attitudes regarding willingness to be self-disclosing before and after counselor training was possible. This suggests a need for longitudinal development of the problem.
- (2) The use of faculty ratings as a criterion measure leaves the study open to criticism regarding rater subjectivity.

- (3) In the case of the self-disclosure inventory, some predictive validity has been established. However, validity has not been thoroughly investigated.

V. DEFINITIONS

Aspects-of-self: the category, topic, or nature of the biographical data that an individual discloses (Jourard, 1964).

Counselor-candidate: or counselor-in-training, counselor trainee or trainee--refers to students enrolled in an individual counseling practicum.

Dyadic effect: describes the contingency between disclosure output and disclosure input in a subject's relationships with others (Jourard and Richman, 1962).

Presentation of self: the manner in which an individual exerts some effect upon the judgments that others make about him (Goffman, 1959).

Response set: a tendency to respond to all questions in the same way regardless of content (Scott, 1963, p. 39).

Self-disclosure: transparency, openness, making the real self known unto others (Jourard and Lasakow, 1958).

Social desirability: the tendency to respond to questions in a socially acceptable or favorable manner without regard to one's real self experience; dissembling or faking to present a socially, desirable self-image (Scott, 1963, p. 40).

Target: the person to whom a disclosure is made (Jourard, 1964).

Total disclosure score: a score derived from the sum of all six aspect-of-self totals.

Total target score: total inventoried disclosure to each target over all six aspects-of-self.

VI. OVERVIEW OF THE THESIS

The report of this study is divided into two parts. Chapters I, II and III, comprising Part I, discuss the underlying theory and method involved in the investigation.

Chapter I, introduced the theoretical formulations from which the problem was derived, provided relevant assumptions and limitations and presented operational definitions of some of the terms.

Chapter II, presents a review of related literature and the hypotheses.

Chapter III consists of a description of the research design --the sample used, and the method of data collection.

Part II, consisting of the remaining chapters, and appendices presents and describes the findings and relevant conclusions of the study in Chapter IV. Discussion of results, a statement of the implications arising from these, and suggestions for future research, are presented in Chapter V. The appendices contain a copy of a written invitation to participate in the investigation and a copy of the instruction page for each of the inventories.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

I. INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, the literature review discusses the theoretical framework underlying the study. This is projected through the review of studies carried out under that framework or ones closely allied to it.

Three main areas of investigation will be considered:

(1) those dealing with the importance of self-disclosure in a helping relationship; (2) those dealing with counselor personalities in general; (3) those dealing with supervisor ratings of counselors-in-training during their counseling practicum. Relevant definitions will be included.

II. SELF-DISCLOSURE

The desirable nature of openness of the counselor about his own thoughts and emotional existence has a firm place in psychological theory. Theoretically it is tied to the capacity of the counselor to comprehend the affective communication of clients and to his ability to establish effective relationships (Allen, 1966).

Allen (1966) goes on to say that the personality of the counselor is unquestionably the most important element in the determination of a successful therapeutic situation. He concerned himself with

one specific aspect of counselor personality, psychological openness, which he defined as "the degree of access which a person has to his own thoughts and feelings" (Allen, 1966).

Using two measures of psychological openness, the Rorschach Index of Repressive Style (RIRS) and the Graduate Supervision Report Scale (GSRS), Allen (1966), tested counselors in training for counselor effectiveness as a function of openness. Four of his six predictions, drawn from his general hypothesis that a relationship exists between psychological openness and effectiveness as a counselor, were supported.

Rogers (1958) extended the expression of counselor openness beyond that of Allen. For Rogers it also meant that, not only does the effective counselor have access to his thoughts and feelings, but also that these are both in direct line with his self expression. He describes this form of openness as congruence. Therefore, if a counselor is congruent, his words are in line with his feelings and immediate thoughts rather than there being a split among these. Rogers (1958) reported a study by Halkides (Ph. D., 1958) who tested Rogers' theory regarding the essentials for an effective counselor personality. She hypothesized that the degree of counseling effectiveness was proportional to the extent of constructive personality change in the client. This varied with four counselor variables: (1) the degree of empathic understanding of the client manifested by the counselor; (2) the degree of positive affective attitude (unconditional positive regard) manifested by the counselor toward the client; (3) the extent to which the counselor's response matches the client's

expression in the intensity of affective expression; and the final aspect, most relevant here: the extent to which the counselor is genuine, his words matching his own internal feeling.

Results were significant in all cases except the investigation of the matching intensity of affective expressions. Most important for this study, Halkides found that the rating of the counselor's congruence--the extent to which his words matched his feelings was associated with the outcome of the case at a 0.001 level of significance (Rogers, 1958).

Truax and Carkhuff (1963) agree that the successful therapist presents his real person in the therapeutic encounter. They state:

Building upon the cornerstone of therapist transparency, the therapist's communication of non-possessive warmth and acceptance of the patient and the therapist's ability to sensitively and accurately understand the patient, both appear to broaden the narrow base of patient transparency encountered at the outset of therapy . . . non-possessive warmth can perhaps best be seen as a way of minimizing threat and hence minimizing the need for defensiveness (and thus opaqueness) on the part of the patient (1963).

In their exploration of client and therapist transparency as functional in a successful counseling situation, Truax and Carkhuff (1963) discussed research which grew out of a four-year investigation into individual psychotherapy and a three-year study of group psychotherapy. They defined therapist transparency as follows: "Transparency or self-congruence involves the element of self-awareness and the presentation to the patient of a real person in the encounter" (Truax and Carkhuff, 1963). Truax (1962b) developed

a scale to measure the occurrence of therapist transparency within the psychotherapeutic situation.

Truax (1963) asked judges to rate how open or 'real' the therapist appeared to be according to a five-point scale. Each point on the scale specified a stage along a continuum from "The therapist is clearly defensive . . ." to "The therapist is freely and deeply himself . . ." (1962).

In the study, Truax and Carkhuff (1963) explored the relationship between therapist transparency or self-disclosure and client self-disclosure in the course of psychotherapy. They found that: "The greater the therapist's transparency, the greater the patient's transparency, or self-exploration throughout the course of therapy." (Pearson ' r ' = .43; $p \leq .05$, one-tailed test). To test the relationship from moment to moment throughout therapy, the Pearson ' r ' was computed on the 306 samples (drawn from 16 cases). The correlation of .19 ($p \leq .01$), though small, provides some suggestion that when the therapist was open, the patient reciprocated and went deeper into self-exploration. They found further support for this in a study of 80 patients who had received intensive group psychotherapy. "The correlation between therapist transparency or self-congruence and patient transparency or self-exploration was .79 ($p \leq .05$) . . ." (Truax and Carkhuff, 1963). Truax and Carkhuff (1967, p. 329) concluded that "The therapist within the relationship, be himself integrated, genuine and authentic seems most basic to therapeutic outcome. Without such genuineness, a trusting relationship could scarcely exist." This led them to ask: "Can the counselor expect

openness, self-acceptance and personal freedom from the client if he himself lacks these qualities in the relationship (1967, p. 328).

Recently Jourard (1964), through clinical experience and research, arrived at the point of a similar query. He suggested that man attains and maintains healthful functioning by being his real self. This must be accompanied by finding goals and objectives that have meaning and life-directing value. More simply, genuine openness or self-disclosure presents a symptom of, as well as a means toward, being a fully functioning human. One comes to know oneself best through disclosing oneself to another person.

In contrast to the presentation of a public self, one must courageously share one's "here and now", or immediate real self, with another. The type of relationship where both participants present themselves in this way corresponds to Buber's I-thou relationship (1937).

Jourard, too, feels that this open self-presentation is essential in counseling, and for the counselor. When the therapist presents other than his genuine immediate concern, a professional self perhaps, he is engaging in exactly the type of behavior that probably brought the client to him for help. In other words, he is not allowing himself to be known. In the extreme, this results in neurotic or psychotic behavior. When we succeed too well in hiding our being from others, we tend to lose touch with our real selves. However, Mayo (1967) used a modified form of Jourard's self-disclosure inventory with an added other-disclosure score, to investigate the tendency toward transparency or self-revealingness in neurotic in-patients, normals with neurotic symptoms, and normals. He found no

clear support for the hypothesis that neurotics are less disclosing than normals. He did find a significant relationship between self and other disclosure. This reciprocity of disclosure supports findings by Jourard (1968b), Jourard and Lasakow (1958) and Truax and Carkhuff (1963). Jourard (1964), more explicitly than others, sees the attitude of withholding of the self as the modern dilemma. Like Fromm (1956), he views modern man as an alien unto himself and to others. The state of self-concealment is in fact the assumed goal state for adult man.

Jourard (1964) developed a self-report questionnaire to assess the amount of self-disclosure to various target persons. His investigations with this and similar inventories has uncovered a broad range of differences in the extent to which individuals report having made themselves known.

A brief sampling of his findings will be presented:

Jourard and Lasakow (1958), from a sample of 300 liberal arts students, drew a subsample of 10 white males, 10 white females, 10 Negro males, and 10 Negro females. These people were all unmarried and in all cases, parents were alive. The average age was approximately twenty-one years. The 60 item Self-Disclosure Inventory was administered to the 40 members of the subsample. They found that the four groups differed in total disclosure with white more open than Negroes and females more so than males. There was considerable variation as to the amount of disclosure to different target persons. Mother received the greatest amount of disclosure with lesser amounts to Father, Male Friend and Female Friend. Race differences once again

depicted Negroes as being less disclosing to the Father (target) than were whites.

The amount of disclosure also varied according to aspects of self. High disclosure was evident where Tastes and Interests, Attitudes and Opinions, and Work were concerned. Low disclosure occurred when Money, Personality and Body were considered.

Significant interaction was found between targets and aspects, groups and targets, and groups, targets and aspects. Specific differences also occurred according to marital status. The effect of marriage did not increase or decrease the total amount of disclosure but did result in a redistribution of self-disclosure. Married Ss disclosed less to parents and same-sex friend than unmarrieds, with the maximum amount occurring toward the Spouse.

Subsequent investigations have supported these findings. Differences in reported self-disclosure, according to likeability or role of target persons, were also found by Jourard (1959a), and Jourard and Landsman (1960). Jourard and Landsman (1960) learned that a 'dyadic effect' or a mutuality of disclosure occurred where the amount of personal information disclosed to a specific other was contingent upon the amount that the 'other' was also willing to disclose. Jourard and Richman (1962) further investigated the mutual nature of self-disclosure.

In order to measure this, two questionnaires were administered. A 40-item Disclosure Output questionnaire was given to 58 unmarried male and 51 unmarried female undergraduates. At the same time, the same questionnaire, with appropriate changes in instructions and in

the wording of items, was administered to measure Disclosure Input.

The main findings can be summarized as follows:

- (1) Both males and females reported more disclosure output in relation to friends and same-sexed parent.
- (2) Females obtained higher mean scores than males for both input and output for each person and for total scores.

Jourard summarizes these findings in this way:

" . . . subjects who report they have revealed a great deal of personal information to their parents and closest friends, likewise report that those target persons have disclosed a lot to them." The implications of this for the present study involves the generalizability of the dyadic effect to the counseling relationship. Jourard and Richman (1962) summarize its importance as follows: " . . . in the patient-therapist dyad, patients will disclose themselves most fully when the therapist is likewise 'transparent'" (Hora, 1960; Jourard, 1959b; Jourard, 1961a, Jourard, 1961b; Mullen and Sanguilians, 1961) and "congruent" (Gendlin, 1959; Rogers, 1961); that is when he discloses his experience to the patient as fully as he expects the latter to reveal his experiencing to him." These findings were exemplified in the results of Jourard's study of student nurses.

Jourard (1962a) studied grades in nursing education. He learned that nursing students receiving the highest ratings for ability to establish and maintain a communicative relationship were significantly higher disclosers on a self-disclosure inventory,

administered one year prior to the rating, than were students who received lower ratings. This implies that a self-disclosure measure may be useful to predict future performance in vocations involving the establishment of the helping relationship, i.e. counseling.

In unpublished research entitled 'Project Replication', Jourard (1968b), reports findings of more recent investigations into this 'dyadic effect'. His immediate concern was with the effect of the experimenter in investigations involving human subjects; however, many of his findings have a direct implication with respect to counselor influence in the counseling relationship.

To explore the latter, Jourard and his associates (1968b) replicated selected studies in psychology wherein the experimenter-subject relationship varied from the objective, anonymous type to one where E disclosed some personal experience to the Ss. The intent behind the latter was that the Ss would experience the E subjectively and would therefore have less tendency to conceal their 'real' self in the situation.

It does seem warranted to propose that the person of the tester, the experimenter, or the clinician is a situational influence upon the disclosure-behavior, spoken or written, of the subject or patient. If the former is an open, disclosing person, he serves as an exemplar of situation-appropriate behavior, and as one who 'invites' comparable openness from those whom he contacts (Jourard, 1968b).

Drag (1968), a student of Jourard's, supported this in her exploration of the problem. She found that when E was transparent with Ss, Ss tended to trust her more, reported themselves to be more willing to be open on intimate topics at a deeply personal level with her and

with other Ss, than did Ss when E remained an impersonal interviewer, or an anonymous "other" (Jourard, 1968b). Other student investigations entered the domains of self-disclosure and learning (Frey, 1968), self-disclosure and empathy (Skafte, 1968), self-disclosure and impression change (Rubin, 1968), encounters between high and low disclosers (Resnick, 1968), and self-disclosure and the "look" of the experimenter (Friedman, 1968). The findings of these studies further support the idea that the relationship between a psychological researcher and his subjects is differentially experienced by the subjects and this in turn affects what they will disclose of themselves.

The significance of this for the present study is obviously bound in the disclosing behavior, or willingness to be transparent, of counselors in training. As Jourard (1968b) so aptly puts it:

Men will show themselves most fully to men who earn their trust through allowing themselves to be known. It is now time for we psychologists, who have sought to know our subjects, to let our subjects know us.

Sex, age and race differences also reappeared in later studies (Jourard, 1961g), nationality (Jourard, 1961d, Lewin, 1948), security (Powell, 1962), aptitude for certain types of academic work (Jourard, 1961c), and personality differences (Jourard, 1961f).

West (1968) considered differential aspects of self-disclosure. Basically, he thought that disclosure of self-relevant data could prove more harmful than beneficial if certain factors about the target person, i.e. trustworthiness, were not accurately perceived. He assumed that due to socialization, the individual became relatively stable in his presentation of self. Normally when the person was uncertain as to the

attitude of the receiver, he engaged in guarded disclosures. West (1968) defined guarded disclosures as ". . . feelers, to determine if the situation meets the requirements of a disclosing, confiding or back region relationship." The relevance of this to counseling rests in the counselor establishing a climate of trust wherein the client may be open, with a feeling of security.

West (1968) draws heavily from Jourard (1958) to emphasize the importance of selectivity or appropriateness of self-disclosure. In accordance, he hypothesized the occurrence of psychological differentiation in selectivity of disclosure of important aspects of self. He did not find significant support for this main tenet. However, he did learn that a slight correlation exists between anxiety and amount of self-disclosure. He indicated that high anxiety is associated with high disclosure and low anxiety is associated with low disclosure. High anxiety also contributed to greater target and greater target by aspect selectivity. West (1968) did not find support for Jourard and Lasakow's (1958) sex difference factors. His adolescent sample revealed that adolescent girls do not disclose significantly more than adolescent boys. However, girls were significantly more disclosing with respect to self-centered concerns, home and family relations, and boy-girl relations, than are boys.

III. THE COUNSELOR PERSONALITY

The current focus of activity in the mental health field is diverging from a medical-deficit orientation to one of prevention and mental health (Ilardi & May, 1967). With the emergent goals of

psychology based upon the intent to guide man preventively in psychological wellness, the importance of understanding persons within the situation cannot be overstressed. Since the helping relationship is largely reducible to the relationship between two people (Brams, 1961), it follows that both members influence its success. Until quite recently, research focussed mainly upon the person of the client with the counselor operating on the basis of what by edict was good counseling procedure, was a constant. However, with Laytons' (1961) realization that various constructs (self, other, reality) change for both the counselor and client as counseling progresses, the counselor became a 'legitimate' subject for study.

Recent literature contains a substantial number of theoretical statements to the effect that the personality of the counselor is the most important variable in determining the outcome of the counseling relationship. Brams (1961) explored the relationship between counselor traits and effective communication in counseling. He used a rating scale devised by Anderson and Anderson (1954) to measure rapport between counselor and client, as a criterion.

Since it is widely held that maladjusted persons do not make effective counselors, Brams hypothesized that a significant negative relationship would exist between counseling trainee scores on specific scales of the MMPI and the criterion and that a significant positive relationship would exist between the criterion and certain other MMPI scales.

Using 27 graduate students, 22 male and 5 female, he also explored the relationships between the criterion and the Manifest

Anxiety Scale (MAS) (Taylor, 1953) and the Index of Adjustment and Values, (IAV) (Bills, Vance, and McLean, 1951).

These tests were given while trainees were in the practicum course. Male and female groups were combined where allowable, and intercorrelations between the personality tests and the criterion were computed. Their findings suggested that male trainees try to create a positive impression on others, are somewhat defensive, but are sensitive to others and appear outgoing in interpersonal relationships. The IAV results demonstrated that mean self concept of the trainee group was significantly closer to the ideal self concept than was that of the norm group. They also concluded that trainees were relatively tolerant of ambiguous stimuli.

It appears that the instruments used in this study were not particularly suitable for test-sophisticated graduate students. To improve this, Brams (1961) suggests that ". . . an intensive global analysis of personality of a small group of 'good' counselors, or even of only one counselor would yield valuable results."

Holt (1962) studied change in certain personality variables in counselor trainees. He concluded that changes occur during training. (These findings are supported by Tyler, 1961; Truax and Carkhuff, 1967). He also found that counselors differ from other professionals in personal traits. In this regard, Karmel (1962) compared teachers and counselors on the MMPI. One hundred counselors completed the MMPI and were asked to administer it to a teacher of similar marital status, age and educational background.

He found that some similar patterns emerged, but that there

were also distinct differences. Teachers appeared more self-depreciating and anxious with tendencies toward withdrawal and introversion than did counselors.

Using the MMPI as well as the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, Cottle, Lewis and Penney (1954) also found a set of items that differentiated between counselors and teachers. Cottle and Wands (1955) administered these items to male high school counselors and comparable male high school teachers in a manner similar to Karmel (1962). Cottle, Pownall, and Steimal (1955) did the same sort of study of female counselors and comparable female teachers. In each case a core of items consistently discriminated between these two professional types (Tyler, 1961).

Reeling (1962) identified specific differences between counseling oriented undergraduates and those who were not counseling oriented. His sample consisted of 314 students in an educational psychology course at Indiana University. Data was collected by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS), Otis Quick Scoring Mental Ability Tests, Gamma Test and an information sheet.

He learned that: (1) undergraduates have a positive attitude about guidance, (2) that there are specifiable factors common to undergraduates who are contemplating a graduate major in guidance, (3) that these students can be identified by using a standardized personality inventory.

IV. COUNSELOR PERSONALITY AND JOB SUCCESS

A few investigators have explored relationships between

personal characteristics and some aspects of counseling. Coutts (1962) studied selected characteristics of counselor-candidates, during the time that they were involved in a counseling practicum, and their relatedness to competency as rated by their supervisors. He attempted to identify score patterns on two interest inventories, the Kuder Preference Record, Occupational Form D, and the Study of Values. Data were obtained from 214 candidates.

The results of the Kuder did not provide a statistically significant difference between rated levels of competency in the counseling function. Certain scores on the Study of Values for male counselor candidates did, however, discriminate at the .05 level between rated competency levels. Also, those male candidates rated most favorable, in comparison with those rated less favorable, demonstrated the following qualities: (1) they are less concerned with what is 'useful' and with surpassing their fellow men in wealth; (2) they are less prone to desire to manipulate or control others; (3) they are more likely to be kind and sympathetic; (4) they have a tendency toward higher religious values. The number of female candidates was not adequate to provide for meaningful data analysis.

Havens (1968) also searched for personality patterns specific to high performance rated and low performance rated counselors-in-training. He used the MMPI plus two other inventories and the Counselor Questionnaire (CQ). Each of his study group of 159 counselor candidates was also rated by supervisors on a performance criterion.

His findings supported both Coutts (1962) and Scott (1965) in that no single personality pattern characterized all individuals

in either the high or low rated groups. Scott (1965) had considered the problem from a slightly different position.

He had studied the counseling relationship in a school setting. From his observations he concluded that the success of the school counselor depended largely upon his effectiveness in working with a variety of school personnel. To investigate this he used full time graduate students in Guidance and Counseling at the University of Minnesota from 1961 to 1964. Prior to training, each student was given three standard personality tests: the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS), the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (GZTS), and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). Following training, each student was ranked from 1 to 30 by counselor education staff members on the criterion "predicted success as school counselor" (Scott, 1965). The top ten and the bottom ten enrollees composed the study sample.

The results of the study are interesting in that the hypothesis that counselor trainees rated as having high potential for success could be discriminated from those who rated as having lower potential for success, was not supported.

All three studies (Coutts, 1962; Havens, 1968; and Scott, 1965) were consistent in this one respect--that counselors in training exhibit a variety of personal characteristics. The choice of the MMPI in the latter two studies may be a contributing factor. The MMPI was designed specifically for use with abnormals. This lends some support to choosing the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) for use in the present study. The CPI was normed on normal or 'undisturbed'

populations and was specifically designed for use with normals. It seems likely then, that it will provide useful information about personal traits of counselor trainees (This will be discussed more extensively in a later chapter).

Without attempting a complete integration of the results of these studies, there are a few things which lend weight to the importance of the present investigation. One is that openness or the ability to be self-disclosing is an important element in the therapeutic relationship. Counselor transparency facilitates client growth. Therefore, his procedures and techniques seem less important than his attitudes and feelings.

Secondly, it was noted that personal characteristics of counselors are identifiable and distinct from those of other professionals. Some evidence was presented that those counselors-in-training rated as having less potential for job success cannot be differentiated from those rated as having high potential for job success on the basis of personality as measured by a variety of instruments.

V. STATEMENT OF HYPOTHESES

The following hypotheses were formulated for investigation:

Hypothesis I: High-performance-rated counselor-candidates do not differ from low-performance-rated counselor-candidates on personality characteristics as measured by the California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1957).

Hypothesis II: High-performance-rated counselor-candidates and low-performance-rated candidates differ as to willingness to be

self-disclosing (transparent) as measured by the Self-Disclosure Inventory (Jourard, 1964).

In investigating Hypothesis II, differences between mean disclosure scores, total disclosure scores, total aspects-of-self scores and total target scores were calculated for the two groups. Relationships arising among CPI scores and total disclosure scores and final grade were considered.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

I. THE SAMPLE

The subjects for this study were drawn from among students enrolled in a graduate practicum in individual counseling. The purpose of the practicum was to improve the students' ability to establish a growth-producing relationship during counseling.

There were fifty-five students in the class. All were invited to participate in the project. Forty-four responded to form the sample used. Of these, eleven were female, and thirty-three were male. These composed the sample used to test Hypothesis I.

In testing Hypothesis II, only married males were used. This reduced the original sample to thirty.

To test each hypothesis, the sample was divided into high-rated and low-rated trainees. Ratings were determined from a nine-point scale ranging from 0 to 9. High-rated students were defined as those with scores of 8 or 9; whereas, low-rated students received scores of 4 to 7 inclusive. To test the extremities of the distribution, these groups were re-defined. The high-rated group consisted of those trainees with grades of 9, whereas low-rated trainees received scores of 6 or less.

Additional information was derived by a subsequent division of the thirty married males according to disclosure scores. This

resulted in four groups: low-rated, low-disclosure (L-R, L-D), low-rated, high-disclosure (L-R, H-D), high-rated, low-disclosure (H-R, L-D), and high-rated, high-disclosure (H-R, H-D).

II. INSTRUMENTATION AND DATA COLLECTION

A number of evaluative instruments based on a variety of theoretical constructs have been used to assess the qualities of students preparing to become counselors (i.e. MMPI, EPPS, GZTS). Numerous attempts have been made to use such instruments in helping to understand the counselor and to help him understand himself. This study was conducted in an effort to develop new information about counselor characteristics in lieu of recent information concerning qualities important in a helping relationship.

A . PERSONALITY MEASURES

The data will be largely collected by means of two inventories: one designed to measure personal characteristics in general, the California Psychological Inventory (CPI); and one to measure counselor trainee willingness to be transparent, the Jourard Self-Disclosure Inventory (SDI₆₀). Both measures deal with traits involved in social interaction and were chosen because of their relevance in the specific interaction occurring in a counseling relationship.

(1) California Psychological Inventory (CPI) (Gough, 1967)

The CPI is a descendant of the MMPI and is specifically designed for use with relatively normal high-school and college students. Kelly (1965), calls it "a comprehensive, multidimensional assessment of

normal persons in a variety of settings".

The inventory consists of 480 items, 200 of which are derived from the MMPI (Schaffer, 1957). Twelve items are duplicated for ease of machine scoring. The number of items in the individual scales ranges from 22 for each of the Py and Fx scales to 56 for the Sp scale. The items from each scale are mixed randomly throughout the inventory. It is of the self-answer or self-administering variety with instructions requiring a response to each item on a separate answer sheet. Answers are given as "true" or "false" according to whether the respondent feels that the statement "is" or "is not" true about him.

The test consists of 18 scales which are divided into four groups. Eighteen raw scores, three of which are designed to detect dissimulation (Gi, Good Impression; Wb, Well-being; and Cm, Communal-ity) can be usefully converted to standard scores by a table provided in the Manual (Gough, 1957, p. 38, 39).

In reference to these three scales, Gough (1957) has pointed out that individuals obtaining high Gi scores do, in fact, tend to create a better impression on others, and show some realistically better adjustment (Cantor, 1963). Cantor (1963) also points out that Jackson (1960) concluded that a response set often occurs. Cantor (1963) also reports that effort to correct for response bias on the CPI had resulted in little improvement and even a reduction of validity. This suggests that normal scores, response set and all are meaningful aspects of the 'real' personality (Cantor, 1963).

Fourteen out of the 18 scales were developed by item analysis against external criteria. The Socialization Scale, (So) for example,

discriminates between delinquents and non-delinquents and also has relationships with adjectival descriptions of normal persons (Scott, 1964). Four of the 18 scales--Social Presence, Self-Acceptance, Self-Control, and Flexibility--were formulated by content and refined by item analysis for internal consistency (Gough, 1957).

Gough (1957) does not maintain that any one of the 18 scales measures a trait that is totally independent from any of the others. The manual provides a wealth of information regarding scale interaction (Gough, 1957, p. 8). However, Gough (1961) cautioned that the usefulness of the test can only be realized to the extent that results are integrated to form a total picture of the respondent. Subtest scores shouldn't be considered as a basis for inference of trends.

Vast amounts of empirical data exist which describe the validity of the CPI as a research instrument. The test manual also outlines reliability and validity data supportive of the test's merit. The manual, too, provides an extensive bibliography of relevant research in which this instrument was used. These are too numerous to review here. The manual also includes correlations among the separate CPI scales and between CPI scales and other inventories (Gough, 1957, pp. 36, 37).

The norming population, although not a random sample of the general population does include a wide range of ages, socio-economic groups and geographical areas. The norms are based upon results from 6,000 males and 7,000 females. Kelly (1965) describes the CPI as ". . . one of the best, if not the best instrument of its kind," since the profile covers personality more broadly and is better

validated than most other inventories.

(2) The Self-Disclosure Inventory (Jourard, 1964).

The Self-Disclosure Inventory is a 60-item questionnaire designed to assess the amount of self-disclosure to various target persons. The items form ten groupings within each of six categories of information about the self (aspects-of-self).

Aspects-of-self include Attitudes and Opinions, Tastes and Interests, Work (or studies), Money, and Personality and Body. Targets or Target persons include "Mother", "Father", "Male Friend", "Female Friend", and "Spouse".

Test instructions invite the respondent to read each item and indicate, according to a rating-scale, the extent that he had talked about that item to each of the target persons. The self-disclosure rating-scale was as follows:

- 0: Have told the other person nothing about this aspect of me.
- 1: Have talked in general terms about this item. The other person has only a general idea about this aspect of me.
- 2: Have talked in full and complete detail about this item to the other person. He knows me fully in this respect, and could describe me accurately.
- X: Have lied or misrepresented myself to the other person so that he has a false picture of me.
(Jourard, 1964, p. 164)

Scores are determined by summing the numerical entries (X's are counted as zeros).

Jourard (1964) reports an odd-even reliability check to be $r = .94$ which indicated that the Ss were responding consistently over

all targets and aspects of self. Pederson and Breglio (1968) report that Himelstein and Kimbrough (1963) in a validation study of the SPI₆₀ obtained non-significant correlations between total self-disclosure score and the amount of disclosure by graduate students making personal introductions in a classroom situation. Another attempt at validation involved a correlation of inventory results with peer judgments of the extent to which an individual would likely be self-disclosing. No significant relationships occurred (Pederson and Breglio, 1968).

Pederson and Breglio (1968) attempted to explore the validity of the original Self-Disclosure (60-item) Inventory as well as a shorter 25-item version.

Both questionnaires were administered to the 52 Ss. Each inventory yielded four scores indicating the extent that Ss revealed they had been self-disclosing to the four targets and a total disclosure score.

They devised a Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (SDQ) to measure actual depth of disclosure. This was also given to the Ss. Correlations between the 10 Jourard scores and 7 SDQ scores showed that total amount of disclosure was highly correlated with actual depth of disclosure. Although, limited in applicability, the study did point out some potential of the Jourard Inventory.

Jourard (1962a) reported successful predictive validity of the questionnaire. In the study, self-disclosure scores predicted overall achievement of nursing students involved in a four-year nursing college program. The findings indicated the extent to which the

Ss said they had disclosed to significant others was highly related to obtaining good grades in nursing college.

Therefore, there is some suggestion that Jourard's Self-Disclosure Inventory taps an important non-intellective factor which may be predictive of success in the helping professions (Pederson and Breglio, 1968). It is for this reason that this inventory was chosen to measure self-disclosure in counselor-trainees.

B. DESCRIPTION OF FINAL PRACTICUM GRADES

The practicum training period consisted of two academic terms with a different supervisor assigned to a particular trainee for each term. Counselor trainees were required to see several clients each week in either a school or a clinical setting. Evaluation of counselor growth was made on the basis of taped sessions which the trainee presented before classmates and supervisors.

At the end of each term, the supervisor was asked to rate his current trainee. A counseling Practicum Evaluation Sheet was given to each supervisor as a guide to the task of rating (see Appendix 'A'). A nine-point rating system was used and was designated as follows:

- 9 -- outstanding
- 8 -- above average
- 7 -- average
- 6 -- below average
- 5 -- pass for diploma students, fail for
graduate students
- 4 -- or less, failure

Using this scale, the supervisors were asked to rate each counselor-candidate on four aspects:

- (a) Counseling relationship - including

sensitivity, openness, flexibility, etc.

- (b) Professional responsibility - confidentiality, punctuality for appointments, etc.
- (c) Interest and effort - sincerity, initiative, etc.
- (d) Inter-professional relationships - effective working relationships with persons in related professions, etc.

(For a complete presentation of the Counselor Evaluation Sheet, please see Appendix C.)

The rating for each term was derived from these four grades. The grades of the two supervisors were then considered for each trainee along with comments of seminar leaders and the course instructors to determine the final rating.

The weakness of this approach rests in the difficulty of reaching accurate consensus among the raters. Since each of the four aspects to be considered in rating were not officially weighted as to importance, the significance of any one aspect could possibly be different for each supervisor. For example, the ability of a trainee to be open may have been of major importance to one supervisor, whereas confidentiality may have been perceived by another as primal. However, the final ratings were chosen for use in this study as the best available source of information.

PART II: DATA ANALYSIS, IMPLICATIONS AND APPENDICES

CHAPTER IV

I. TREATMENT OF DATA AND CONCLUSIONS

The two inventories, the CPI and SDI₆₀, were administered during a regular seminar period. Assurance of the confidentiality of results and the proposed availability of individual scores and profiles initiated the testing session.

Students' final grades were obtained from departmental files. Table I shows the number of students receiving scores on the grading scale from 1 to 9.

Table I

FINAL GRADES FOR TRAINEES IN THE INDIVIDUAL COUNSELING PRACTICUM

(n = 44)

Rating:	n:
9	4
8	15
7	21
6	1
5	2
4	1
3	0
2	0
1	0
Total	44

II. TREATMENT OF DATA

A. THE CPI

Upon completion, CPI answer sheets were machine scored and individual profiles were plotted on standard CPI profile sheets.

Means and standard deviations were computed for the total sample, $n = 44$, as well as for the following sub-groupings:

(1) two groups divided by sex: males, $n = 33$; females, $n = 11$.

(2) two groups formed according to ratings, males only--high-rated, H-R (those with grades of 8 or 9) and low-rated, L-R, (those with grades of 4 to 7 inclusive).

(3) two groups formed of those males at the extremities of the grade distribution; H-R, those with grades of 9 ($n = 4$) and L-R, those with grades of 6 or less ($n = 3$).

(4) four groups, married males only, $n = 30$, divided first according to grade (H-R, L-R) and again as to total disclosure score (L-R, L-D; L-R, H-D; H-R, L-D; H-R, H-D).

Tables II and III present the means and standard deviations for males and females on CPI scales.

The variation for the female sample seems to parallel that of the male sample, (S.D. = 2.52 to S.D. = 6.94).

In both cases, the Cm (Communality) scale shows the least variation. Males varied most widely on Sc (Self-control) whereas, for females the widest dispersion occurred on the Do (Dominance) scale.

SUMMARY OF $\bar{X}$'s, & S.D.'s OF CPI SCORES
FOR MALE TRAINEES,
(n = 33)

Scale:	$\bar{X}$:	S.D.:
Do	28.5	4.84
Cs	21.6	3.02
Sy	26.2	4.37
Sp	39.9	5.84
Sa	23.5	5.93
Wb	37.7	4.22
Re	29.7	3.53
So	34.4	4.63
Sc	27.7	6.94
To	24.6	4.42
Go	16.3	5.26
Cm	24.7	2.97
Ac	27.5	3.40
Ao	24.5	3.48
Ie	41.9	3.55
Py	14.2	2.52
Fx	14.7	3.78
Fe	17.5	3.55

Table III

SUMMARY OF $\bar{X}$'s, & S.D.'s OF CPI SCORES
FOR FEMALE TRAINEES
(n = 11)

Scale:	$\bar{X}$:	S.D.:
Do	30.1	5.47
Ca	23.4	2.72
Sy	28.1	2.96
Sp	44.2	2.48
Sa	25.3	2.06
Wb	38.8	4.29
Re	29.5	3.14
So	35.4	4.93
Sc	29.2	4.39
To	26.6	2.37
Go	18.6	2.99
Cm	25.1	1.79
Ac	29.3	4.16
Ai	25.4	3.10
Ie	44.3	3.13
Py	14.1	2.42
Fx	16.8	3.74
Fe	22.8	2.62

A difference of means test (t-test) was applied to the data for H-R vs L-R married males. Table IV presents X's, S.D.'s, and t-test results. No significant difference appeared among the eighteen scales between the two groups at the .01 level of confidence. This provides support for Hypothesis I that high-rated counselor candidates do not differ from low-rated counselor-candidates on personality characteristics as measured by the CPI.

Table IV

SUMMARY OF MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND t-TEST VALUES
OF LOW-RATED VS HIGH-RATED TRAINEES ON THE CPI
(n = 43), (p. $\leq$.01)

Variable	$\bar{X}$ Low- rated:	$\bar{X}$ High- rated:	S.D. (LR)	S.D. (HR)	DF	t	p two- tailed
Do	28.54	29.37	4.44	5.40	41	-.54	.59
Cs	22.04	22.00	3.31	2.51	41	.04	.96
Sy	26.50	26.79	4.03	4.15	41	-.23	.82
Sp	41.33	40.42	5.55	5.31	41	.53	.60
Sa	23.75	24.16	5.20	5.31	41	-.25	.81
Wb	37.33	38.79	4.66	3.25	41	-1.13	.27
Re	28.96	30.47	3.48	3.02	41	-1.47	.15
So	34.92	34.26	5.06	3.93	41	.45	.65
Sc	26.79	29.58	7.09	4.85	41	-1.43	.16
To	24.21	26.16	4.56	2.96	41	-1.58	.12
Gi	16.29	17.47	4.51	5.14	41	-0.78	.44
Cm	24.75	24.89	3.17	1.94	41	-0.17	.87
Ac	27.13	29.00	3.39	3.52	41	-1.73	.09
Ai	24.08	25.42	3.81	2.46	41	-1.30	.20
Ie	41.79	43.26	3.64	3.21	41	-1.35	.18
Py	13.79	14.74	2.27	2.55	41	-1.25	.22
Fx	14.42	16.16	3.37	4.06	41	-1.50	.14
Fe	17.50	20.32	4.18	3.04	41	-2.41	.02

A difference between the two groups did occur at the .02 confidence level on the Fe (Femininity) scale. This finding was not in the direction of support of Hypothesis I.

Further clarification was sought by testing the extremities of the rating distribution. This was done to maximize the occurrence of significant differences between mean scores of high-rated and low-rated trainees on the CPI scales.

Two sub-groups were formed on this basis with H-R or high-rated trainees referring to students with grades of 9 and L-R or low-rated trainees referring to students with grades of 6 or less. Due to smallness of sample size, the Mann-Whitney U test was used to test for differences (see Table V). This test is one-tailed with a .05 confidence level (Seigel, 1956, p. 118).

The findings of this test support those presented in Table IV with the exception of the following: (1) the Fe (Femininity) scale does not differ significantly between the two sub-groups, and (2) significance at the .05 level of confidence occurred on one scale, Ai (Achievement via Independence). This finding is not in the direction of support for Hypothesis I that the CPI scales would not differ significantly between high-rated and low-rated trainees.

To explore relationships among the CPI, the SDI₆₀ and the final practicum grade, a multiple discriminant function was applied to the data. The sample was limited to the thirty married males to allow for consideration of disclosure to spouse on the SDI₆₀.

To do this, the sample was first divided according to the criterion and then sub-divided according to high or low total disclosure scores. This resulted in four groups: low-rated, low-disclosure (L-R, L-D), low-rated, high-disclosure (L-R, H-D), high-rated, low-disclosure (H-R, L-D) and high-rated, high-disclosure (H-R, H-D) trainees. Table VI presents the findings.

Table V

MANN WHITNEY U TEST--CPI SCORES FOR LOW-RATED ($n = 3$)
 VS HIGH-RATED ($n = 4$) TRAINEES
 ($\alpha = .05$)

CPI:	U:	P:
Do	6	.571
Cs	6	.571
Sy	4	.314
Sp	2	.114
Sa	6	.571
Wb	5	.429
Re	4	.314
So	5	.429
Sc	2	.114
To	4	.314
Gi	5	.429
Cm	2	.114
Ac	4	.314
Ai	0	.028
Ie	6	.571
Py	6	.571
Fx	3	.200
Fe	6	.571

Note: for probability derivations see Seigel, 1956, p. 271

Table VI

SUMMARY OF MULTIPLE DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS FOR CPI
 RESPONSES OF MARRIED MALES FROM THE FOUR SUB-GROUPS:
 LR-LD, LR-HD, HR-HD, HR-LD
 (n = 30)

Root:	χ^2	d.f.	Critical χ^2 values: $\alpha = .05$
1	31.02	20	31.41
2	13.60	18	28.87
3	12.15	16	26.30

Note: for critical χ^2 values, see Ferguson, p. 309.

The multiple discriminant function (Cooley & Lohens, 1968) allowed consideration of the problem in the following way: we could consider the possibility that a weighted combination of CPI scales might significantly differentiate among the four groups (whereas single scales did not). Table VI shows that in one case, Root 1, $\chi^2 = 31.02$ approaches significance at the .05 level. The other two cases were not significant. This indicates that the best weighted combination of scales could not discriminate among the groups. This lends further support to Hypothesis I wherein it was stated that the CPI would not discriminate among high-rated and low-rated trainees.

Profiles were prepared for the various groups. In the case of the 33 males and 10 females, the mean scale scores are plotted along with those derived by Gough (1957) from his samples of male and female graduate students in psychology.

A brief look at these two profiles reveals little obvious difference between the groups used in this investigation and those of

Gough's (1957) studies. The male practicum students scored somewhat lower in all respects than Gough's (1957) male subjects. In both instances, Classes I, III and IV, Poise, Ascendancy, and Self-assurance, Achievement potential and Intellectual Efficiency, and Intellectual and Interest Modes, respectively, are elevated whereas Class II, Socialization, Maturity and Responsibility, is below the standard score mean. In the latter case, the To (Tolerance) scale is elevated above the standard score mean for both groups.

For females a similar parallel exists between Gough's (1957) female subjects and practicum trainees. Again Classes I, III and IV are elevated above the standard score mean with Class II below for all scales except To (Tolerance). To is above for both groups, whereas, Re (Responsibility) is slightly elevated for the Gough (1957) group only.

The profiles of the four groups (L-R, L-D; L-R, H-D; H-R, L-D; H-R, H-D) clearly illustrate the findings of the multiple discriminate analysis. Graphically, they do not appear to differ significantly on any of the scales except on Ai (Achievement via Independence) where there is one standard deviation difference between groups I and II and Sa (Self-acceptance) where a similar difference occurs between groups II and IV.

B. THE SDI₆₀

Means and standard deviation were calculated for married males, $n = 30$, on total target scores, best male friend (MF), best female friend (FF) and spouse (Sp).

(See Table VII.)

Table VII

$\bar{X}$'s & S.D.'s OF TOTAL TARGET SCORES AND TOTAL DISCLOSURE
SCORES FOR MARRIED MALES, n = 30, on SDI₆₀

Total Target	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
MF	63.1	22.3
FF	53.4	24.9
Sp	97.5	15.5
Total Disclosure	213.6	56.6

Note: MF = Male Friend, Max. Score = 120
 FF = Female Friend, Max. Score = 120
 Sp = Spouse, Max. Score = 120
 Total Disclosure, Max. Score = 360

To test Hypothesis II that high-rated trainees and low-rated trainees would differ as to willingness to be self-disclosing, the thirty married males were divided according to final grade. The two groups consisted of eighteen high-rated trainees (H-R) and twelve low-rated trainees (L-R). T-tests were applied to test the differences between the total target means and the differences between the total disclosure means for the two groups. In Table VIII, the maximum total target score = 120, whereas, the maximum disclosure score equals the sum of the three target maximums = 360. There were no significant differences among the group means for Male Friend, Female Friend, or Total Disclosure. Significance at the .10 level of confidence was approached for disclosure to spouse. Although significance was not reached, the direction of this difference is consistent with Hypothesis II. No significant differences occurred at the .05 level. This evidence supports rejection of Hypothesis II that the two groups could be

differentiated on the basis of total disclosure scores.

Table VIII

SUMMARY OF t -TESTS - $\bar{X}$'s & S.D.'s OF
TOTAL TARGET SCORES AND TOTAL DISCLOSURE SCORES
FOR MARRIED MALE TRAINEES, $n = 30$

Variable:	$\bar{X}$ L-R	$\bar{X}$ H-R	SD, L-R	SD, H-R	DF	t	P (two tail)
Male Friend (Max. Sc. = 120)	60.33	67.00	21.87	22.29	28.	-0.784	0.44
Female Friend (Max. Sc. = 120)	51.11	56.92	21.87	28.52	28.	-0.608	0.55
Spouse (Max. Sc. = 120)	93.56	103.50	15.64	13.24	28.	-1.750	0.09
Total Disclosure Score (Max. Sc. = 360)	204.33	227.42	54.62	56.59	28.	-1.080	0.29

Table IX

FIRST ASPECT (ATTITUDES), $n = 30$
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR LR Vs.
HR MARRIED MALES, $n = 30$

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Between Subjects	1051.12				
'A' Main Effects	97.12		97.12	2.85	0.10
Subjects Without Groups	954.01		34.07		
Within Subjects	560.67				
'B' Main Effects	251.34		125.67	24.64	0.00*
'A*B' Interaction	11.21		5.60	1.10	0.34
'B' x Subjects Within Groups	285.58		5.10		

*significant at $p \leq .01$

Table X

SECOND ASPECT (INTERESTS), n = 30
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Between Subjects	1556.32	29		0.74	0.40
'A' Main Effects	40.03	1	40.03		
Subjects Within Groups	1516.31	28	54.15		
Within Subjects	1058.00	60			
'B' Main Effects	707.04	2	353.52	64.79	0.00*
'A*B' Interaction	8.23	2	4.11	0.75	0.48
'B' x Subjects Within Groups	305.61	56	5.46		

*significant at $p \leq .01$

Table XI

THIRD ASPECT (WORK), n = 30
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE.

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Between Subjects	942.45	29			
'A' Main Effects	1.56	1	1.56	0.05	0.83
Subjects Within Groups	940.90	28	33.60		
Within Subjects	1059.34	60			
'B' Main Effects	633.62	2	316.81	42.56	0.00*
'A*B' Interaction	8.72	2	4.36	0.59	0.56
'B' x Subjects Within Groups	416.86	56	7.44		

*significant at $p \leq .01$

Table XII

FOURTH ASPECT (MONEY), n = 30
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Between Subjects	1369.39	29			
'A' Main Effect	20.43	1	20.43		
Subjects Within Groups	1348.97	28	48.18	0.42	0.52
Within Subjects	3347.34	60			
'B' Main Effects	2470.82	2	1235.41	85.57	0.00 *
'A*B' Interaction	3.73	2	1.87	0.13	0.88
'B' x Subjects Within Groups	808.51	56	14.44		

* significant at $p \leq .01$

Table XIII

FIFTH ASPECT (PERSONALITY), n = 30
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Between Subjects	1072.46	29			
'A' Main Effects	31.79	1	31.79	0.86	0.36
Subjects Within Groups	1040.68	28	37.17		
Within Subjects	1564.67	60			
'B' Main Effects	945.70	2	472.85	43.63	0.00 *
'A*B' Interaction	13.99	2	7.00	0.65	0.53
'B' x Subjects Within Groups	606.91	56	10.84		

*significant at $p \leq .01$

Table XIV

SIXTH ASPECT (BODY), n = 30
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Between Subjects	2187.67	29			
'A' Main Effects	69.70	1	69.70	0.92	0.35
Subjects Within Groups	2117.37	28	75.62		
Within Subjects	1549.34	60			
'B' Main Effects	1008.64	2	504.32	55.62	0.00*
'A*B' Interaction	.99	2	0.50	0.05	0.95
'B' x Subjects Within Groups	507.75	56	9.07		

* significant at $p \leq .01$

Further consideration to self-disclosure patterns was given. An analysis of variance (two-way, repeated measures, Winer, 1952) was applied to data for the two groups, H-R vs. L-R, married males, to ascertain the existence of mean differences on each of the six categories of information about the self (See Tables IX to XIV).

In no instance did the 'A' main effect, the final rating, prove significantly different for the two groups ($p \leq .01$). Membership in the low-rated group did not provide or result in significantly different mean aspect-of-self scores than did membership in the group of high-rated trainees. This further supports the rejection of Hypothesis II.

Although there were no significant differences in regard to the 'A' main effect, final grades, the analysis of variance evidenced a significant 'B' or target effect on each aspect (See Tables IX to

XIV). This suggests that the amount disclosed about each aspect differed significantly with the target person toward whom the disclosure was made. When a t-test was applied to mean differences on total inventoried disclosure, disclosure to spouse approached significance (See Table VIII). This indicated that the two groups H-R and L-R could be somewhat differentiated on the basis of total target disclosure means. Coupled with the evidence just presented further analysis seemed in order (See Tables IX to XIV).

Total group means were computed for each aspect-of-self. The same three targets, MF, FF and Sp, were used in the analysis. The question for consideration now was, which target had the greatest influence on amount of disclosure for the total group, $n = 30$?

To determine this, a Scheffé (1953) test was applied to the mean disclosure scores for targets on each aspect-of-self. The results show that on every aspect-of-self, the target, spouse, significantly influenced amount of disclosure ($p .01$) (See Tables XV to XX). These findings were further clarified by the factor analytic results.

Table XXI presents means and standard deviations of the group of married males on age, disclosure to targets (the sum of target disclosure on each of the aspects), and final practicum grade. These were used in the factor analysis.

Table XV

SUMMARY OF SCHEFFÉ TEST OF $\bar{X}$ DIFFERENCES AMONG
TOTAL TARGET SCORES FOR FIRST ASPECT (ATTITUDE);
MARRIED MALES, $n = 30$

Target	MF	FF	Sp
MF	1.00	0.02	0.00*
FF	0.02	1.00	0.00*
Sp	0.00*	0.00*	1.00

Table XVI

SUMMARY OF SCHEFFÉ TEST OF $\bar{X}$ DIFFERENCES AMONG
TOTAL TARGET SCORES FOR SECOND ASPECT (INTERESTS);
MARRIED MALES, $n = 30$

Target	MF	FF	Sp
MF	1.00	0.48	0.00*
FF	0.48	1.00	0.00*
Sp	0.00*	0.00*	1.00

Table XVII

SUMMARY OF SCHEFFÉ TEST OF $\bar{X}$ DIFFERENCES AMONG
TOTAL TARGET SCORES FOR THIRD ASPECT (WORK);
MARRIED MALES, $n = 30$

Target	MF	FF	Sp
MF	1.00	0.03	0.00*
FF	0.03	1.00	0.00*
Sp	0.00*	0.00*	1.00

* significant at $p \leq .01$

Table XVIII

SUMMARY OF SCHEFFÉ TEST OF $\bar{X}$ DIFFERENCES AMONG
TOTAL TARGET SCORES FOR FOURTH ASPECT (MONEY);
MARRIED MALES, $n = 30$

Target	MF	FF	Sp
MF	1.00	0.03	0.00*
FF	0.03	1.00	0.00*
Sp	0.00*	0.00*	1.00

Table XIX

SUMMARY OF SCHEFFÉ TEST OF $\bar{X}$ DIFFERENCES AMONG
TOTAL TARGET SCORES FOR FIFTH ASPECT (PERSONALITY);
MARRIED MALES, $n = 30$

Target	MF	FF	Sp
MF	1.00	0.10	0.00*
FF	0.10	1.00	0.00*
Sp	0.00*	0.00*	1.00

Table XX

SUMMARY OF SCHEFFÉ TEST OF $\bar{X}$ DIFFERENCES AMONG
TOTAL TARGET SCORES FOR SIXTH ASPECT (BODY);
MARRIED MALES, $n = 30$

Target	MF	FF	Sp
MF	1.00	0.37	0.00*
FF	0.37	1.00	0.00*
Sp	0.00*	0.00*	1.00

*significant at $p \leq .01$

Table XXI

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF MARRIED MALES
ON AGE, DISCLOSURE TO TARGETS (SDI₆₀)
AND FINAL PRACTICUM GRADE, n = 30

Aspect of Self	Variable	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
1. Attitudes	A G E	30.73	6.17
	M	14.53	4.01
	F	12.87	4.84
	Sp	17.03	2.33
2. Interests	M	11.00	4.97
	F	10.27	5.27
	Sp	16.70	3.14
3. Work	M	12.97	3.82
	F	11.07	4.72
	Sp	17.40	2.96
4. Money	M	7.97	5.81
	F	6.47	5.60
	Sp	18.40	2.76
5. Personality	M	9.43	4.42
	F	7.60	4.48
	Sp	15.20	3.62
6. Body	M	6.37	5.47
	F	5.27	5.41
	Sp	12.97	5.54
Final Rating		7.33	

Table XXII presents four factors, varimax rotation. Factor I, Disclosure to Male and Female Friend, clearly suggests that disclosure to male and female friend has no relationship to disclosure to spouse. The amount of disclosure on any aspect-of-self is influenced differently by friends than by spouse. The direction of this influence cannot be specified from this factor. On Factors I, II and IV, we do note, however, that there is little or no influence

of spouse in relation to that of other targets on three aspects, Money, Personality and Body.

Factor II, Tendency to Disclose, illustrates that there is a generally high tendency to disclose to all targets in all aspects with the exception of the spouse, in regard to money and the best male friend with regard to personality. Disclosure to male friend about the body is somewhat low and is unrelated to disclosure to female friend or spouse. The amount disclosed about the body is greatest towards the spouse.

Factor III, Disclosure to Spouse, suggests high disclosure to spouse on all aspects-of-self. There is no relationship between disclosure to spouse and disclosure to best female friend on any aspect. In regard to the first and fifth aspects (Attitudes and Personality) disclosure to female friend is negatively related to disclosure to spouse. Disclosure to spouse is somewhat related to disclosure to best male friend on the second, third and fifth aspects.

Factor IV, Predicted Counselor Success, shows that age is negatively related to achievement. More simply, the younger the person is, the higher his grade. Disclosure about attitudes, work or studies and personality to best female friend is negatively related to achievement. This is the same for disclosure to spouse on Aspects I and III. The lower the disclosure, the higher the grade on three aspects. This lends added support to the rejection of Hypothesis II.

Considering the factor loadings of grades, in Factor I we see that high disclosure to male and female friends is negatively

Table XXII

SUMMARY OF FACTOR ANALYSIS OF AGE, SDI60 AND
FINAL RATING OF MARRIED MALES, n = 30 (VARIMAX)

			Disclosure				
Variables			h^2	I	II	III	IV
<u>Attitudes</u>	A G E (Aspect)(Target)	1	0.644	-0.644	0.102	0.070	-0.771
	M	2	0.832	0.340	0.838	0.121	-0.016
	F	3	0.826	0.480	0.770	-0.039	-0.031
	Sp	4	0.664	0.156	0.695	0.392	-0.056
<u>Interests</u>	M	5	0.793	0.244	0.789	0.315	0.109
	F	6	0.854	0.366	0.809	0.251	0.046
	Sp	7	0.645	0.067	0.518	0.590	0.153
<u>Work</u>	M	8	0.762	0.565	0.308	0.417	-0.416
	F	9	0.810	0.669	0.455	0.101	-0.380
	Sp	10	0.834	0.112	0.276	0.836	-0.217
<u>Money</u>	M	11	0.576	0.636	0.305	0.164	0.226
	F	12	0.625	0.691	0.359	0.026	0.135
	Sp	13	0.701	0.009	0.019	0.814	0.192
<u>Person- ality</u>	M	14	0.717	0.776	0.007	0.323	-0.105
	F	15	0.713	0.810	0.210	-0.091	-0.071
	Sp	16	0.694	0.248	0.282	0.726	0.161
<u>Body</u>	M	17	0.850	0.821	0.285	0.117	0.286
	F	18	0.826	0.820	0.308	0.092	0.223
	Sp	19	0.657	0.348	0.509	0.264	0.454
Rating:		20	0.568	-0.057	0.198	0.294	0.662
variance totals:			14.590	5.055	4.533	3.077	1.926
% total variance: 72.95				25.28	22.67	15.39	9.63
% common variance: 100.00				34.65	31.06	21.08	13.20

related to age and to rating. This suggests that the younger the person, the lower the disclosure to male and female friend and the higher the disclosure, the lower the final grade. In Factors II and III, neither final grade nor age were significantly related to other variables.

Although the female sample was too small for meaningful analysis, means and standard deviations were prepared for total disclosure to male friend, to female friend and overall total disclosure score (See Table XXIII).

Table XXIII

$\bar{X}$'s AND S.D.'s OF FEMALE TRAINEES, $n = 10$, FOR DISCLOSURE
TO MALE FRIEND, TO FEMALE FRIEND AND
TOTAL DISCLOSURE

Variable:	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Male Friend	73.2	21.2
Female Friend	77.0	19.4
Total Disclosure	150.0	38.9

The factor analytic results provided evidence that a negative relationship exists between grades and willingness to be open. This suggests that better students tend to be lower disclosers.

In sum, the practicum students appear to be intelligent, resourceful persons who are not particularly high disclosers, and who indicate definite preference as toward whom they will be open.

C. CONCLUSIONS

The treatment of the data has led to the following conclusions:

- (1) That high-rated and low-rated trainees do not differ significantly in personal characteristics: (a) as

measured by the CPI; (b) as measured by total disclosure scores on the SDI₆₀; or (c) as measured by total disclosure scores and best weighted combinations of CPI scales.

This suggests support for Hypothesis I that high-performance-rated counselor-candidates do not differ from low-performance-rated counselor-candidates on personality characteristics as measured by the CPI, and rejection of Hypothesis II that high-performance-rated counselor-candidates and low-performance-rated counselor-candidates differ as to willingness to be self-disclosing as measured by the SDI₆₀.

- (2) CPI profiles of mean scores for both male and female trainees suggest that they possess attributes consistent with being confident, ambitious, active, enterprising, imaginative, intelligent and alert. Both male and female groups appear to be somewhat lower in skills requiring planfulness, responsibility, patience, resourcefulness and concern for making a good impression. They do, however, seem capable, independent, well-informed, observant, insightful and appreciative (for a more detailed description, see Appendices).
- (3) Additional SDI₆₀ findings showed target preference with spouse having the greatest influence on willingness to disclose.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

I. DISCUSSION

Hypothesis I, that the CPI would not differentiate between high-rated and low-rated trainees was supported ($p \leq .01$). This is consistent with studies done by Coutts (1962), Havens (1968), and Scott (1965).

However, the Ac (Achievement via Conformity) scale approached significance in differentiating between the two groups at $p \leq .10$ level (See Table IV) and when testing the extremes of the rating distribution, the Ai (Achievement via Independence) scale differed between the two groups at the .05 confidence level (see Table V). This evidence provides some support for Gough's expectations of these scales (Gough, 1957). Both the Ac and Ai scales were designed for the prediction of academic achievement at the highschool and university level respectively (Gough, 1953, 37, 361-366). Considering this, the findings of the present study suggest that the final practicum grade consists of intellectual or achievement-oriented attitudes. More simply, it appears that in determining the final grade, more weight was attributed to the students' abilities relating to academic achievement than was given to other characteristics measured by the CPI, i.e. To (Tolerance).

On the basis of the findings, Hypothesis II, that the SDI₆₀ would discriminate between the two groups, was rejected. This was not supported by investigations of Allen (1966), Jourard (1962), or Truax and Carkhuff (1968). In each of these studies, self-disclosure was defined in a similar manner. However, the Jourard (1964) works were the only ones that used the SDI₆₀ as a measure of disclosure.

The present findings did not support those of Jourard (1962, 1964, 1968). Relevant to this are Jourard's finding that the SDI₆₀ differentiated between those students rated high in ability to establish and maintain communicative relationships and those who were rated low in this regard. Students who were highly rated were significantly higher disclosers on the test (1962). The present study found that high-performance-rated and low-performance-rated (predicted ability to establish and maintain facilitative counseling relationships) trainees were not significantly different as to amount disclosed. However, the sample used in this study had markedly different characteristics from those of Jourard, i.e. married males as opposed to single females. Also total disclosure scores were derived from disclosure scores to different targets. In the case of the nurses, (Jourard, 1961c), the target spouse, was not appropriate for consideration. This focused disclosure upon four targets: mother, father, male friend and female friend. In the present study, the target spouse was used; however, due to a significant number of deceased parents of members of the sample, the parent targets were

omitted. This centered disclosure around only three targets, male and female friends and spouse.

Additional findings of the present study also did not support findings of Jourard et al. (1964, p. 192). In the majority of those investigations, the following findings were consistently upheld: (1) that there was an order of target preference with spouse receiving maximum disclosure (1964, p. 177-180); (2) certain aspects-of-self were disclosed more fully by subjects to various targets than were others, i.e. information bearing upon work or studies was more disclosable than that bearing upon one's financial status or feelings about problems relating to one's body (1964, p. 177); (3) women indicated that they disclosed more about themselves than did men (1964, p. 179-180).

In the present study, amount of disclosure varied according to target person as well as according to aspect-of-self. The target spouse did exert maximum influence over amount disclosed, but was not consistently the receiver of the greatest amount (See Table XXII). There were no significant differences between male and female friends in the amount disclosed on any aspect (See Table XXII). It was not meaningful to analyse data from the female groups due to smallness of sample size. However, means and standard deviations calculated for two targets over the total female group resulted in no order of preference in amount disclosed between male and female friends (See Table XXIII).

Again differences in the population from which the sample

was drawn are worth noting. The Jourard populations were undergraduate students and were on the average much younger (average age = 23.4 years for married males, Jourard, 1964, p. 166). The present group were enrolled in a graduate practicum and were on the average over six years older ($\bar{X}$ = 30.1 years) than the Jourard sample. Such differences could well have influenced the nature of the outcome.

The factor analytic results allow a more precise consideration of the possible influence of the mean age differences between those groups used in Jourard's work and those used in the present study. If one can accept the premise that the older the person the greater the opportunity for him to realize social benefits attainable through conformity, then the following discussion is relevant.

This assumption suggests that the older adult understands that by adherence to social expectation he attains certain desired goals. These goals are often denied to youth due to rebelliousness against and interrogation of the established system. Student riots on campuses across Canada and the U.S. and the consequent conservative reaction of the older adults provide an example of this. This pattern of conformity vs. non-conformity, identifiable within particular age groups, allows some explanation of the disclosure differences between the trainees involved in the present study and those of the Jourard work. In the former case, spouse did not receive maximum disclosure. Furthermore, Table XXII shows that disclosure to spouse is consistently low for all factors with the exception of Factor IV and Aspects I, II and VI on Factor II. The tendency to be consistently non-disclosing

to spouse about aspects not related to work, money or personality may reflect conformity to social expectation. If we may assume that graduate males respond in terms of middle-class role expectations, Jourard's explanation of the male-role model applies (1964, p. 6-55).

The North American expectation of the male is that he has great emotional control, he is emotionally unexpressive, he is self-reliant and he shoulders the responsibility of decisions (Jourard, 1964, p. 6-55). There is, however, little factual evidence to suggest that males are less capable of responding to life within a broad range of feelings than are females (Jourard, 1964). Therefore, this expectation requires the male to dissemble or deny individual experience to maintain the masculine image. Such dissembling consumes much energy and results in closedness rather than openness.**

If the male is totally responding to this ideal, wherein, it is unmanly to be open and known, he will likely be difficult to love and his needs may go unmet.

Some men are so skilled at dissembling, at 'seeming', that even their wives will not know when they are lonely, bored, anxious, in pain, hungering for affection, etc. And the men, blocked by pride, dare not disclose their despair or need. (Jourard, 1964, p. 52).

Response to such an expectation could well result in a type of limited disclosure to spouse found in the present study.

**Jourard, et al. (Jourard, 1961, Jourard & Lasakow, 1958, Jourard & Landsman, 1960, Jourard & Richman, 1963) found that research supported this idea.

Other factors which may have influenced the results include the following: (1) the SDI₆₀ has not been normed on a Canadian population. The findings could therefore be a reflection of some difference within the cultural milieu; (2) the smallness of the sample may also have contributed to the results being different; (3) another influential factor involves the general test-wiseness of graduate psychology students. Snyder (1957, 4, 9-13) points out: "It has been very difficult to find fresh, subtle measures of counselor personality because of the psychological sophistication of graduate students."

II. IMPLICATIONS

The information presented supports, to some extent, the idea that the award of final practicum grades places little emphasis on the personal characteristics of the trainee.

One could reasonably expect, from the importance attached to counselor openness in the counseling relationship (Rogers, 1958; Truax & Carkhuff, 1963, 1968; Jourard, 1968; Goffman, 1962; West, 1968) that one would find significant differences in this regard between those trainees who are considered best and those who are considered poorest in the practicum course. From the theory and research presented in Chapter II, counselor personality is of great import in the establishment and maintenance of a growth-producing relationship. Therefore, it appears that more than high-intellective or verbal-cognitive skills are essential in the making of a

successful counselor.

This suggests that careful consideration should be given to personal characteristics and to the provision of opportunity for personal growth of counselor candidates: (1) at the time of selection of students for the counselor training program; and (2) during the course of the practicum experience. This approach has been found successful in other counselor training centers (Truax & Carkhuff, 1968; McNeilly, 1969).

III. SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

While the first hypothesis was confirmed, some interesting trends were established with the CPI (See Ch. IV, pg. 42 profiles). These findings suggest that future work might explore the usefulness of the CPI in describing rather than predicting the characteristics inherent to a similar student group. Larger sample size would also enhance the generalizability of results. More particular interest could surround relationships between specific CPI scales and openness, i.e. To (Tolerance) related to willingness-to-be-disclosing.

Although the second hypothesis was not supported, theoretical considerations lead one to suggest the importance of further searches into counselor transparency. Replication of Jourard and Landsman's (1962) work considering the 'dyadic' nature of disclosure could prove fruitful. The establishment of criteria in addition to supervisor ratings might be derived from client-counselor mutuality of disclosure ratings. More simply, some other measure of counselor success (i.e. one which included the

growth feelings of the client) may have proven more adequate than supervisor ratings in the present study.

The relationships between trainee self-disclosure and other aspects of a good counseling relationship, i.e. empathy, are also worthy of exploration.

Future studies might also consider sex, and marital status differences. An accurate measure of depth of disclosure would add rigor to such investigations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, Wakefield T., Counselor in Training; A study of role effectiveness as a function of openness. Dissert. Abst., XXVII, 4099-A.
- Bordin, E. S., Psychological Counseling, New York: Appleton-Century, 1955.
- Brams, Jerome M., Counselor characteristics and effective communication in counseling. Jnl Consult. Psychol., Vol. 8, No. 1, 1961, 25-30.
- Buber, M., I and Thou, New York, Scribners, 1937.
- Callis, R., Polmantier, P. C., and Roeber, E. C., Five years of research on counseling. J. Counsel Psychol., 1957, 4, 119-123.
- Cantor, F. M., Simulation on the CPI and the adjustment of the simulator. Jnl. Consult. Psychol., 1963, 27, 253-256.
- Cottle, W. C., Personal characteristics of counselors: (1) a review of the literature. Personnel Guid. J. 1953, 31, 445-450.
- Cottle, W. C., & Lewis, W. W., Jr., Personality characteristics of counselors: (II) male counselor responses to the MMPI and GZTS. J. Counsel. Psychol., 1954, 1, 27-30.
- Cottle, W. C., Lewis, W. W., Jr., & Penney, M. M., Personality characteristics of counselors: (III) an Experimental Attitude Scale. J. Counsel. Psychol., 1954, 1, 74-77.
- Cottle, W. C., Pownall, J. E., & Steimal, R. J. Counselors and teachers take the Experimental Attitude Scale, Pers. Guid. J., 1955, 33, 374-378.
- Cottle, W. C. & Wands, H. O., High school counselors and teachers take the Experimental Attitude Scale, J. Counsel. Psychol., 1955, 2, 28-31
- Coutts, Robert L., Selected characteristics of counselor candidates in relation to level and types of competency in the counseling practicum. Dissert. Abst., XXIII, 1601, 1962.

- Crites, Bechtoldt, Goodstein, Heilbrun, A Factor Analysis of the CPI, J. Appl. Psychol., 1961, 45, 408-414.
- Cronbach, Lee J., Essentials of Psychological Testing, Harper & Row, New York, 1960.
- Dicken, C. F., Simulated Patterns on the CPI, J. Counsel. Psychol., 1960, 7, 24-31.
- Dibner, A. S., Ambiguity and anxiety. J. Abn. Soc. Psychol., 1958, 56, 165-174.
- Dymond, Rosalind, F., Personality and empathy, J. Consult. Psychol., 1950, 4, 343-350.
- Fair, Donald C. Human Intimacy An Essential Element in Counselling, Canadian Counsellor, Vol. 2, No. 4, October, 1968, 221-226.
- Ferguson, Geo. A., Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education, McGraw-Hill Inc., Toronto, 1966.
- Ferguson, Larry W., The development of sensitivity to non-verbal communication as it relates to empathy in counselling relationship. M. Ed., Thesis, 1966.
- Fromm, Erich, The Art of Loving, 1st ed., New York, Harper, 1956.
- Goffman, E. (1956). The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life, New York: Doubleday, 1959.
- Gough, H. G., McClosky, H. & Meekl, P. E., A personality scale for social responsibility. J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., 1952, 47, 73-80.
- Gough, H. G., California Psychological Inventory-Manual., Consulting Psychologists Press Inc., Palo Alto, California, 1961.
- Halkides, G., An experimental study of four conditions necessary for therapeutic change. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1958.
- Hanley, Charles, Deriving a measure of test-taking defensiveness, Jnl Consult. Psychol., 1957, 21, 391-397.
- Havens, R. I., An Exploratory Search for Characteristic Patterns of High-Performance-Rated and Low-Performance-Rated Counselor Candidates in a Counseling Practicum, Dissert. Abst., XXVIII, 104-A, 1966.

- Hills, J. R., The influence of instructions on personality inventory scores, Jnl of Counsel. Psychol., Vol. 8, 1961, 43-48.
- Himmelstein, P., & Kimcbrough, W. K., A study of self-disclosure in the classroom. J. of Psychol., 1963, 55, 437-440.
- Himmelstein, P. & Lubin, B. Attempted validation of the self-disclosure inventory by the peer-nomination technique, J. of Psychol., 1965, 61, 13-16.
- Holt, Fred Duard, A study of Change in Certain Personality Variables of Counselors in Training, Dissert. Abst., XXIII, 3775, 1962.
- Ilardi, Robert L., May, Theo. W., A reliability study of Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory, APA paper, Atlanta, April, 1967.
- Jourard, S. M., Healthy personality and self-disclosure, Ment. Hyg., 1959, 43, 499-507 (a).
- _____. I-thou relationship versus manipulation in counseling and psychotherapy. J. Individ. Psychol., 1959, 15, 174-179 (b).
- _____. Self-Disclosure and other-cathesis, J. Abn. Soc. Psychol., 1959, 59, 428-431 (c).
- _____. Age trends in self-disclosure, Merrill-Palmer Quart., 1961, 7, 191-198 (a).
- _____. Religious denominations and self-disclosure. Psychol. Rep., 1961, 8, 446 (b).
- _____. Self-disclosure patterns in British and American college females. J. Soc. Psychol., 1961, 54, 314-320 (c).
- _____. Self-disclosure and Rorschach productivity, Percept. Mot. Skills, 1961, 13, 232 (d).
- _____. Self-disclosure scores and grades in nursing college. J. Appl. Psychol., 1961, 45, 244-247 (e).
- _____. Project Replication. Unpublished Research Papers, University of Miami, Florida, 1968.
- _____. The Transparent Self. D. Van Nostrand Co. Inc., Princeton, N.J., 1964.
- Jourard, S. M. & Korman, L. A., Getting to know the experimenter and

- its effect on psychological test performance. Jnl Hum. Psychol., Fall, 1968, 155-159.
- Jourard, S. M. & Landsman, M. J., Cognition cathexis and the dyadic effect in men's self-disclosing behaviors. Merrill-Palmer Quart., 1960, 6, 178-186.
- Jourard, S. M. & Lasakow, P., Some factors in self-disclosure. J. Abn. Soc. Psychol., 1958, 56, 91-98.
- Jourard, S. M. & Rubin, Jane E., Self-disclosure and touchability; A study of two modes of interpersonal encounter and their inter-relation, Jnl of Hum. Psychol., Spring, 1968, 39-49.
- Karmel, Louis, J., An Analysis of the Personality Patterns and Academic and Social Backgrounds of Persons Employed as Full-Time Counselors in Selected Secondary Schools in the State of North Carolina, Dissert. Abst., 1961.
- Kelly, E. Lowell, from Buros, The Sixth Mental Meas. Yrbk., The Gryphon Press, Highland Park, N.J., 1965, 71-72. (CPI Review).
- Kinzer, John R. The Educational Counselor, Jnl Counsel. Psychol., 1961, 14-16.
- Layton, Weber, L., Constructs and Communication in Counseling: A Limited Theory, Jnl Counsel. Psychol., Vol. 8, 1961, 3-7.
- Liddle, G., CPI and Certain social and personal factors, J. Ed. Psychol., 1958, 49, 144-149.
- Lohnes, Paul R., and Cooley, Wm. W., Introduction to Statistical Procedures: with Computer Exercises; John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, Toronto; 1968; p. 144, 174, 198-204, 215-225.
- Lubin, Bernard, & Harrison, Roger L., Predicting Small Group Behavior With the Self-Disclosure Inventory, Psych. Report, 1964, 15, 77-78.
- Lubin, Bernard, A modified version of the Self-Disclosure Inventory, Psychol. Rep., 1965, 17, 498.
- Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality, 1954, Harper & Bros., 49 East 33rd St., New York 16, N.Y.
- Mayo, P. R., Self-Disclosure and Neurosis, British Jnl. of Soc. Psychol.

- McGehearty, Joyce J. Factors Associated with the Probable Success of Prospective School Counselors as Evaluated by their Peers and Staff Members, Dissert. Absts. XXVI, 873, 1965.
- Pederson, Darhl M., & Breglio, Vincent J., The Correlation of Two Self-Disclosure Inventories with Actual Self-Disclosure: A Validity Study, Jnl of Psychol., 1968, 68, 291-298.
- Perls, Frederick, S., Herrerline, R. F., Goodman, Paul. Gestalt therapy; excitement and growth in the human personality. New York, Julian Press, 1951.
- Pierog, Rita. A comparison of trained and untrained counselors in their ability to communicate empathy, congruence, and acceptance. M. Ed. Thesis, 1968.
- Rausch, H. L., and Bordin, E. S., Warmth in personality development and in psychotherapy, Psychiatry: J. Study interpers. process, 1957, 20, 4.
- Reed, C. F., Cuadra, C. A. The Role-Taking Hypothesis in Delinquency, Jnl Consult. Psychol., 1957, 21, 286-390.
- Reeling, Glen E., A study of Undergraduate Student Characteristics as an Aid in Early Identification of Potential Counselors, Dissert. Absts., XXIII, 3784.
- Rickers-Ovsiankina, M. A., & Kusmin, A. A., Individual Differences in Social Accessibility. Psychol. Report, 1958, 391-406.
- Rogers, Carl R., The Characteristics of a Helping Relationship, Personnel and Guidance Jnl., Sept. 1958.
- Rogers, Carl R. The necessary and sufficient conditions of psychotherapeutic personality change. J. Consult. Psychol., 1957, 21, 95-103.
- Rosenberg, L. A., McHenry, T. B., Rosenberg, A. M., and Nichols, R.C., The Prediction of Achievement with the California Psychological Inventory, Jnl Appl. Psych., 1962, 46, 385-388.
- Rosenthal, Robert. Experimenter Effects in Behavioral Research, 1966; Meredith Publishing Company, 440 Park Ave. South, New York, N.Y., 310-320.
- Sawatsky, David D., The relationship between open-mindedness and accurate interpersonal perception. M. Ed. Thesis, 1968.
- Scott, Alvin G. The CPI and mothers of anti-social adolescents. M. A. Thesis, 1963, #75, Dept. of Psychology, U. of A., Edmonton.

- Scott, G. Kuper. A Study of the Relationship Between Ratings of Counselor Success and Selected Personality Variables. Dissert. Absts., XXVI-5249.
- Schutz, William C., JOY - Expanding Human Awareness, Grove Press, Inc., New York, 1967, 10-12, 15-21, 50-58.
- Seigel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics, McGraw-Hill, Inc., Toronto, 1956.
- Shaffer, R. Generative empathy in the treatment situation. Psychoanalytic Quart., 1959, 28, 342-373.
- Snyder, W. V., The Psychotherapy relationship. New York: Macmillan, 1961.
- Southern, Mara L., & Plank, W. T., Personality Characteristics of very bright adults. Jnl of Soc. Psych., 1968, 75(1).
- Struck, O. Jr., Empathy: A review of theory and research. Psychol. Newsltr., 1957, 9, 45-57.
- Strupp, H. H. Nature of psychotherapists' contribution to the treatment process. Arch. Gen. Psychiatr. 1960, 3, 219-231.
- Tillich, Paul. The Courage To Be. Published by New Haven, Yale University Press, 1962.
- Truax, Charles B. & Carkhuff, Robert R., Client and Therapist Transparency in the Psychotherapeutic Encounter: from an invited paper, Symposium: The Transparent Self, Amer. Psychol. Assoc., Philadelphia, Aug. 29, 1963.
- Truax, Charles B., & Carkhuff, Robert R., Toward Effective Counseling and Psychotherapy; Aldine Publishing Company; 1967, 1-4, 80; 163-208, 220-336.
- Winer, B. J., Statistical Principals in Experimental Design, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962, 298-318.

California Psychological Inventory

HARRISON G. GOUGH, Ph.D.

DIRECTIONS:

This booklet contains a series of statements. Read each one, decide how you feel about it, and then mark your answer *on the special answer sheet*. MAKE NO MARKS ON THE TEST BOOKLET. If you *agree* with a statement, or feel that it is true about you, answer TRUE. If you *disagree* with a statement, or feel that it is not true about you, answer FALSE.

If you find a few questions which you cannot or prefer not to answer, they may be omitted. However, in marking your answers on the answer sheet, make sure that the number of the statement is the same as the number on the answer sheet.

© Copyright, 1956, by Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this booklet may be reproduced or copied in any way without written permission of the publisher. Copyright in Great Britain.

Printed in U.S.A.



TRADE MARK

CONSULTING PSYCHOLOGISTS PRESS, INC.

ADJECTIVAL DESCRIPTIONS OF CPI SCALES

HIGH SCORES If a person is high on a scale, he is	SCALE AND PURPOSE	LOW SCORES If a person is low on a scale, he is
CLASS I. MEASURES OF POISE, ASCENDANCY, AND SELF-ASSURANCE		
	Aggressive, confident, persistent, and planful; as being persuasive and verbally fluent; as self-reliant and independent; and as having leadership potential and initiative.	1. Do (dominance) To assess factors of leadership ability, dominance, persistence, and social initiative. Retiring, inhibited, commonplace, indifferent, silent and unassuming; as being slow in thought and action; as avoiding of situations of tension and decision; and as lacking in self-confidence.
	Ambitious, active, forceful, insightful, resourceful, and versatile; as being ascendant and self-seeking; effective in communication; and as having personal scope and breadth of interests.	2. Cs (capacity for status) To serve as an index of an individual's capacity for status (not his actual or achieved status). The scale attempts to measure the personal qualities and attributes which underlie and lead to status. Apathetic, shy, conventional dull, mild, simple, and slow; as being stereotyped in thinking; restricted in outlook and interests; and as being uneasy and awkward in new or unfamiliar social situations.
	Outgoing, enterprising, and ingenious; as being competitive and forward; and as original and fluent in thought.	3. Sy (sociability) To identify persons of outgoing, sociable, participative temperament. Awkward, conventional, quiet, submissive, and unassuming; as being detached and passive in attitude; and as being suggestible and overly influenced by others' reactions and opinions.
	Clever, enthusiastic, imaginative, quick, informal, spontaneous, and talkative; as being active and vigorous; and as having an expressive, ebullient nature.	4. Sp (social presence) To assess factors such as poise, spontaneity, and self-confidence in personal and social interaction. Deliberate, moderate, patient, self-restrained, and simple; as vacillating and uncertain in decision; and as being literal and unoriginal in thinking and judging.
	Intelligent, outspoken, sharp-witted, demanding, aggressive, and self-centered; as being persuasive and verbally fluent; and as possessing self-confidence and self-assurance.	5. Sa (self-acceptance) To assess factors such as sense of personal worth, self-acceptance, and capacity for independent thinking and action. Methodical, conservative, dependable, conventional, easygoing, and quiet; as self-abasing and given to feelings of guilt and self-blame; and as being passive in action and narrow in interests.
Energetic, enterprising, alert, ambitious, and versatile; as being productive and active; and as valuing work and effort for its own sake.	6. Wb (sense of well-being) To identify persons who minimize their worries and complaints, and who are relatively free from self-doubt and disillusionment.	Unambitious, leisurely, awkward, cautious, apathetic, and conventional; as being self-defensive and apologetic; and as constricted in thought and action.

CLASS II. MEASURES OF SOCIALIZATION, MATURITY, AND RESPONSIBILITY

Planful, responsible, thorough, progressive, capable, dignified, and independent; as being conscientious and dependable; resourceful and efficient; and as being alert to ethical and moral issues.	7. Re (responsibility) To identify persons of conscientious, responsible, and dependable disposition and temperament.	Immature, moody, lazy, awkward, changeable, and disbelieving; as being influenced by personal bias, spite, and dogmatism; and as under-controlled and impulsive in behavior.
Serious, honest, industrious, modest, obliging, sincere, and steady; as being conscientious and responsible; and as being self-denying and conforming.	8. So (socialization) To indicate the degree of social maturity, integrity, and rectitude which the individual has attained.	Defensive, demanding, opinionated, resentful, stubborn, headstrong, rebellious, and undependable; as being guileful and deceitful in dealing with others; and as given to excess, exhibition, and ostentation in their behavior.
Calm, patient, practical, slow, self-denying, inhibited, thoughtful, and deliberate; as being strict and thorough in their own work and in their expectations for others; and as being honest and conscientious.	9. Sc (self-control) To assess the degree and adequacy of self-regulation and self-control and freedom from impulsivity and self-centeredness.	Impulsive, shrewd, excitable, irritable, self-centered, and uninhibited; as being aggressive and assertive; and as overemphasizing personal pleasure and self-gain.
Enterprising, informal, quick, tolerant, clear-thinking, and resourceful; as being intellectually able and verbally fluent; and as having broad and varied interests.	10. To (tolerance) To identify persons with permissive, accepting, and non-judgmental social beliefs and attitude.	Suspicious, narrow, aloof, wary, and retiring; as being passive and overly judgmental in attitude; and as disbelieving and distrustful in personal and social outlook.
Co-operative, enterprising, outgoing, sociable, warm, and helpful; as being concerned with making a good impression; and as being diligent and persistent.	11. Gi (good impression) To identify persons capable of creating a favorable impression, and who are concerned about how others react to them.	Inhibited, cautious, shrewd, wary, aloof, and resentful; as being cool and distant in their relationships with others; and as being self-centered and too little concerned with the needs and wants of others.

HIGH SCORES If score is 40 or above	SCALE AND PURPOSE	LOW SCORES If score is 30 or below
--	-------------------	---------------------------------------

CLASS II. MEASURES OF SOCIALIZATION, MATURITY, AND RESPONSIBILITY (Continued)

Dependable, moderate, tactful, reliable, sincere, patient, steady, and realistic; as being honest and conscientious; and as having common sense and good judgment.	12. Cm (communality) To indicate the degree to which an individual's reactions and responses correspond to the modal ("common") pattern established for the inventory.	Impatient, changeable, complicated, imaginative, disorderly, nervous, restless, and confused; as being guileful and deceitful; inattentive and forgetful; and as having internal conflicts and problems.
--	--	--

CLASS III. MEASURES OF ACHIEVEMENT POTENTIAL AND INTELLECTUAL EFFICIENCY

Capable, co-operative, efficient, organized, responsible, stable, and sincere; as being persistent and industrious; and as valuing intellectual activity and intellectual achievement.	13. Ac (achievement via conformance) To identify those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any setting where conformance is a positive behavior.	Coarse, stubborn, aloof, awkward, insecure, and opinionated; as easily disorganized under stress or pressures to conform; and as pessimistic about their occupational futures.
Mature, forceful, strong, dominant, demanding, and foresighted; as being independent and self-reliant; and as having superior intellectual ability and judgment.	14. Ai (achievement via independence) To identify those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any setting where autonomy and independence are positive behaviors.	Inhibited, anxious, cautious, dissatisfied, dull, and wary; as being submissive and compliant before authority; and as lacking in self-insight and self-understanding.
Efficient, clear-thinking, capable, intelligent, progressive, planful, thorough, and resourceful; as being alert and well-informed; and as placing a high value on cognitive and intellectual matters.	15. Ic (intellectual efficiency) To indicate the degree of personal and intellectual efficiency which the individual has attained.	Cautious, confused, easygoing, defensive, shallow, and unambitious; as being conventional and stereotyped in thinking; and as lacking in self-direction and self-discipline.

CLASS IV. MEASURES OF INTELLECTUAL AND INTEREST MODES

Observant, spontaneous, quick, perceptive, talkative, resourceful, and changeable; as being verbally fluent and socially ascendant; and as being rebellious toward rules, restrictions, and constraints.	16. Py (psychological-mindedness) To measure the degree to which the individual is interested in, and responsive to, the inner needs, motives, and experiences of others.	Apathetic, peaceable, serious, cautious, and unassuming; as being slow and deliberate in tempo; and as being overly conforming and conventional.
Insightful, informal, adventurous, confident, humorous, rebellious, idealistic, assertive, and egoistic; as being sarcastic and cynical; and as highly concerned with personal pleasure and diversion.	17. Fx (flexibility) To indicate the degree of flexibility and adaptability of a person's thinking and social behavior.	Deliberate, cautious, worrying, industrious, guarded, mannerly, methodical, and rigid; as being formal and pedantic in thought; and as being overly deferential to authority, custom, and tradition.
Appreciative, patient, helpful, gentle, moderate, persevering, and sincere; as being respectful and accepting of others; and as behaving in a conscientious and sympathetic way.	18. Fe (femininity) To assess the masculinity or femininity of interests. (High scores indicate more feminine interests, low scores more masculine.)	Outgoing, hard-headed, ambitious, masculine, active, robust, and restless; as being manipulative and opportunistic in dealing with others; blunt and direct in thinking and action; and impatient with delay, indecision, and reflection.

APPENDIX B

THE SELF-DISCLOSURE QUESTIONNAIRE

People differ in the extent to which they let other people know them. We are seeking to investigate what people tell others about themselves.

Some of the things about yourself you will regard as more personal and private than others; people differ widely in what they consider appropriate to let others know, and what they consider is nobody's business but their own.

INSTRUCTIONS

On the following pages there is a list of topics that pertain to you. You have been given a special answer-sheet. What we want you to do is indicate on the answer-sheet the degree to which you have let each of several people in your life know this information about you. You are to read each item on the questionnaire, and then indicate on the answer-sheet the extent that you have talked about each item to that person; that is, the extent to which you have made yourself known to that person.

Using the rating-scale described below to indicate the extent that you have talked to each person about each item.

- 0: Have told the other person nothing about this aspect of me.
- 1: Have talked in general terms about this item. The other person has only a general idea about this aspect of me.
- 2: Have talked in full and complete detail about this item to the other person. He knows me fully in this respect, and could describe me accurately.
- X: Have lied or misrepresented myself to the other person so that he has a false picture of me.

COUNSELING PRACTICUM EVALUATION

Ed. Psych. 512 1968-69

Term I II (Circle which term)

Name of practicum student: _____

Name of evaluator: _____

Date of evaluation: _____

The following nine-point rating system should be used in making the ratings below:

- 9 - Outstanding
- 8 - Above average
- 7 - Average
- 6 - Below average
- 4 or less - Failure

NOTE: Do not use a rating of "5". This is a "pass" for diploma students but a "fail" for graduate students. Students are to be rated on their merits with no consideration being given to whether they are diploma or degree students.

Rate each of the following characteristics and give an overall evaluation:

- A. Counseling relationship, including sensitivity to client feelings and attitudes, ability to establish "open" and "easy" relationships with clients, flexibility in approach, effectiveness in helping clients to explore needs and define problems, effective relationship with parents, and so on. _____
- B. Sense of professional responsibility, including matters of confidentiality, keeping appointments on time, regular consultations with consultants, and so on. _____
- C. Interest and effort, including sincerity of interest in counseling, efforts to grow as a counselor, initiative and ingenuity, and so on. _____
- D. Inter-professional relationships, including ability to establish effective working relationships with other school staff, with community agencies, with private practitioners in the mental health field, and so on. _____

Overall evaluation _____

Descriptive Statement

Write a paragraph or two on the back describing both assets and weaknesses of the practicum student as he or she has been functioning as a counselor, and give some indication of his or her potential for counseling as you see it. Be as specific as you like. For example, if the student is likely to have a preference for and/or be more successful with clients of a certain age or with certain types of problems, this should be noted.

APPENDIX D

FACULTY OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL
PSYCHOLOGY



THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON, CANADA

MEMO : 512 Practicum Students:

Research must go on, therefore, just a reminder
re: thesis testing - final date for testing is this
Sat., April 12 at 10:00 A.M. in Rm. 106, Educ. Bldg.

Your cooperation is appreciated.

B29925